REMARKS

I.   Status of the Application

Claims 1-22 are pending in this application. In the June 21, 2007 office action, the Examiner:

A.   Rejected claims 7 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite;

B.   Rejected claims 1-3, 5-9, 12-14 and 16-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,013,410 to Asauchi in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,879,973 to Skaanning et al.;

C.   Rejected claims 4 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Asauchi in view of Skaanning further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,727,135 to Webb et al.;

D.   Rejected claims 10, 11, 21 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Asauchi in view of Skaanning further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,168,003 to Lozano et al.

In this response, claims 7 and 18 have been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the respective claims. Claims 2, 3, 5, and 7-22 have been amended to correct informalities. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of the claims and request reconsideration based on the foregoing amendments and following remarks.

II.   Claim Amendments

Claims 2, 3, 5, and 7-22 have been amended. As discussed in more detail in section **III**, claims 7 and 18 have been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the respective claims. In addition, claims 2, 3, 5, and 7-22 have been amended to correct informalities. In particular, claims 2, 3, 5, and 7-22 have been amended to remove the use of the term "wherein." Applicants submit that the claim amendments have not introduced new matter into the claims.

III.   The Indefiniteness Rejection of Claims 7 and 18 Is Now Moot

Claims 7 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. In particular, claims 7 and 18 were rejected for recitation of the limitation "said redirect web pages" for which there was no antecedent basis. Claims 7 and 18 have each been amended to recite "said directive web pages." Antecedent basis may be found for "said directive web pages" in the respective base claims 6 and 12. Accordingly, the indefiniteness rejection of claims 7 and 18 is now moot.

IV.   The Rejection of Claims 1-22 Should Be Withdrawn

Claims 1-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over various combinations of the following references: Assauchi, Skanning, Webb and Lozano. For the reasons discussed below, none of the cited prior art references, either alone or in combination, teaches, shows or

suggests each and every limitation of claims 1-22.

A. Claim 1

Claim 1 was rejected as being obvious over Asauchi in view of Skanning. Claim 1 includes, *inter alia*, limitations of "constructing and sending a peripheral device HTTP message to said web browser from a web server executing in a peripheral device coupled to the computer, the peripheral device HTTP message comprising peripheral device functionality information," and "automatically responding to a directive web page received at the web server with another peripheral device HTTP message comprising functionality information." As discussed below, the combination of Asauchi and Skaanning fails to teach, show or suggest these limitations.

1. Present Invention

Claim 1 is directed to a method for performing diagnostics on a computer peripheral device. According to the method, a computer that includes a web browser is coupled to a backend server via a communication link. A peripheral device that includes a web server is coupled to the computer. Peripheral device functionality information in the form an HTTP message is sent to the web browser of the computer from the peripheral device. The web browser then forwards the HTTP message including the peripheral device functionality information to the backend server. The backend server is configured to request more information from the peripheral device (if needed) by sending directive web

pages to the peripheral device or to transmit a human readable web page
indicating diagnostic results to the web browser of the computer if more
information is not needed. A new peripheral device HTTP message comprising
functionality information is sent via the web server of the peripheral device in
response to the directive web pages. Communication may then continue
between the peripheral device and the backend server until the human readable
web page is constructed by the backend server, which sends the web page to
the web server.

Thus, the method of claim 1 includes, *inter alia*, limitations that the
peripheral device includes a web server and that the web server automatically
respond to directive web pages received from the backend server by
constructing peripheral device HTTP messages. Neither Asauchi, Skaanning
nor any of the cited prior art references teaches, shows or suggests a peripheral
device that includes a web server that is configured to automatically respond to
directive web pages from the backend server by constructing peripheral device
HTTP messages.

2.   Asauchi

Asauchi is directed to a method and system for providing online support
for operation of a device. (Asauchi, col. 1, lines 43-45). The system described
by Asauchi includes a user support center and a client system. The user support
center includes a server system and support personnel. The client system
includes a printer connected by a parallel cable or a LAN to a computer. The

printer includes firmware for controlling printing operations. The computer is configured to access a Management Information Base on the printer to obtain information relating to the operating environment of the printer via the parallel cable. The computer of the client system includes a web browser and is connected to the user support center via the internet. In Asauchi, communication is performed between a client side agent 200 and a server side agent 220. (Asauchi, col. 7, lines 45-67). As shown in FIG. 10 of Asauchi, the client side agent 200 is incorporated into the computer of the client side system. Thus, communication in Asauchi is between the client side agent on the client side computer and the server side agent on the user support side. There is no disclosure in Asauchi that communication is between the server side agent and the printer. More particularly, there is no disclosure in Asauchi that the printer 20 includes a web server that is configured to automatically respond to requests for information from the server system of the user support center by constructing HTTP messages.

3.   Skaanning

Skaanning is directed to a method and system of performing automated diagnosis of printer systems. (Skaanning, Abstract). In Skaanning, a printer diagnostic system 201 is used for diagnosing operation of a printing system. (Skaanning, FIG. 1 and col. 8, lines 58-67). A user on customer PC 205 can access diagnostic system 201 over Internet 202. A web-browser 206 within customer PC 205 is used to access web-server 200. In response to the

customer's interaction with diagnostic system 201, diagnostic system 201

responds with suggestions 203 for diagnostic steps that the customer can

perform. Diagnostic system 201 essentially functions as an expert system that

utilizes artificial intelligence. The customer provides information 204 back to

diagnostic system 201 which informs diagnostic system 201 on the outcome

from acting on suggestions 203. Information 204 may include information 207

the customer obtains from printer server 209 and/or information 208 the

customer obtains from printer 210.

There is no disclosure in Skaanning that the printer 210 includes a web

server that is configured to automatically respond to requests for information

from the diagnostic system 201 at the web-server 200 by constructing HTTP

messages. While Skaanning does disclose the use of a print server 209, there

is no disclosure in Skaanning that the print server 209 is configured as a web

server or that is configured to automatically respond to requests for information

from the diagnostic system 201 at the web-server 200 by constructing HTTP

messages. To the contrary, Skaanning discloses the print server 209 as an

element that may be diagnosed by the diagnosis system 201. (Asauchi, col. 9,

lines 20-25).

4.   Conclusion with Respect to Claim 1

Neither Asauchi nor Skaanning teach, show or suggest, either alone or in

combination, a peripheral device that includes a web server that is configured to

automatically respond to directive web pages from the backend server by

constructing peripheral device HTTP messages. Accordingly, because the combination of Asauchi and Skaanning fails to disclose each and every element of claim 1, a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to claim 1 has not been established. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn.

B.   Claims 2-5

Claims 2-5 depend directly or indirectly from and incorporate all of the limitations of claim 1. Accordingly, for the same reasons as those set forth above in connection with claim 1, Applicants submit that the rejection of claims 2-5 should be withdrawn as well.

C.   Claim 6

Claim 6 was rejected as being rendered obvious over Asauchi in view of Skaanning. Claim 6 includes limitations similar to those discussed above with reference to claim 1. Therefore, the arguments presented above in connection with claim 1 are applicable to claim 6, as amended. Accordingly, for at least those reasons given above in connection with claim 1, Applicants submit that the rejection of claim 6 should be withdrawn as well.

D.   Claims 7-11

Claims 7-11 depend directly or indirectly from and incorporate all of the limitations of claim 6. Accordingly, for the same reasons as those set forth

above in connection with claim 6, Applicants submit that the rejection of claims

7-11 should be withdrawn as well.

E.   Claim 12

Claim 12 was rejected as being obvious over Asauchi in view of

Skaanning. Claim 12 includes limitations similar to those found in claim 1.   For

example, claim 12 includes the limitations of "a peripheral device coupled to said

computer, the peripheral device including a web server, said web server adapted

to construct and send a peripheral device HTTP message to said web browser

comprising peripheral device functionality information," and "said web server

being adapted to respond automatically to a directive web page with another

peripheral device HTTP message comprising functionality information."

Therefore, the arguments presented above in connection with claim 1 are

applicable to claim 12 as well. Accordingly, for at least those reasons given

above in connection with claim 1, Applicants submit that the rejection of claim 12

should be withdrawn as well.

F.   Claims 13-22

Claims 13-22 depend directly or indirectly from and incorporate all of the

limitations of claim 12. Accordingly, for the same reasons as those set forth

above in connection with claim 12, Applicants submit that the rejection of claims

13-22 should be withdrawn as well.

V.   Conclusion

For all of the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit a

patentable contribution to the art has been made. Favorable reconsideration and

allowance of this application are therefore respectfully requested.

In the event applicant has inadvertently overlooked the need for an

extension of time or payment of an additional fee, the applicant conditionally

petitions therefore, and authorizes any fee deficiency to be charged to deposit

account number 24-0037.

Respectfully submitted,
MAGINOT, MOORE & BECK LLP

David M. Lockman
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 34,214

September 21, 2007
Maginot, Moore & Beck LLP
Chase Tower
111 Monument Circle, Suite 3250
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-5109
(317) 638-2922 Telephone
(317) 638-2139 Facsimile